

Kenneth W. Salinger
(617) 573-0561 Telephone: (617) 573-0100
ksalinger@palmerdodge.com Facsimile: (617) 227-4420

April 27, 2001

BY MESSENGER

Mary L. Cottrell, Secretary
Department of Telecommunications and Energy
One South Station
Boston, MA 02110

Re: Docket No. 01-20

Dear Ms. Cottrell:

Verizon has asked for an additional three business days for the filing of Verizon's direct case, and says that "no party will be prejudiced by the short delay." This is only true if the related deadlines for the filing of testimony are extended by three business days for all parties.

I have spoken with counsel for Verizon (Attorney Beausejour), who tells me that Verizon has no opposition to such an adjustment of all three dates for the filing of testimony by all parties to be extended by three business days.

If such similar adjustments are made, then AT&T would have no opposition to Verizon's motion. However, if the Department concludes that such similar adjustments cannot be made, then AT&T would respectfully urge the Department to deny Verizon's motion.

With respect to the date for filing direct testimony, the schedule has always contemplate a simultaneous filing by all parties. It would be unfair to give Verizon until May 4 but still require CLECs to file on May 1, and thereby give Verizon extra time to review and try to refute the direct cases put on by CLECs in their direct filings.

With respect to the subsequent dates for filing testimony, it is worth noting that Verizon warns that its own direct case filing will be "substantial." AT&T does not believe that it could analyze Verizon's direct case, propound discovery and digest the results, and

prepare and file rebuttal testimony in less than the four weeks presently provided in the procedural schedule. Similarly, we could not file surrebuttal testimony in any less than the three weeks currently provided for. We do not expect that even with best efforts we could do the work that needs to be done in less time than is currently provided.

Thus, if the Department is inclined to look favorably on Verizon's motion, we respectfully request that: (i) the filing date for direct testimony be extended to May 4 for all parties, not just for Verizon; (ii) the date for the filing of rebuttal testimony be extended by a similar three business days, to June 6; and (iii) the date for the filing of surrebuttal testimony also be extended by three business days, to June 27. Doing so should not require any change in the currently scheduled hearing dates. [\(1\)](#)

Very truly yours,

Kenneth W. Salinger

pc: Paul B. Vasington, Commissioner

Hearing Officer Tina Chin (two copies by messenger)

Michael Isenberg, Director, Telecommunications Division

Berhane Adhanom, Telecommunications Division

JeeSoo Hong, Telecommunications Division

April Mulqueen, Telecommunications Division

Service List

bpc: Dr. Patricia Jacobs

Robert Aurigema, Esq.

Jeffrey F. Jones, Esq.

Jay E. Gruber, Esq.

Erica Pitzi

1. 1 If for some reason it is not possible to move the intervening dates for the last two rounds for filing testimony, then fairness would require that Verizon's motion be denied. Verizon has known literally for months that it is required to meet a May 1 filing deadline. Back in February Verizon sought to extend this deadline to May 14, but the Department denied that request and instead extended it only to May 1. It would be unfair for Verizon's inability to comply with the current deadline to result in Verizon getting a last minute benefit, and participating CLECs to be penalized by not having sufficient time to put on a proper case.